



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,901	12/01/2000	Michael J. Recchia JR.	652 P 006	3682

27717 7590 02/11/2005

SEYFARTH SHAW  
55 EAST MONROE STREET  
SUITE 4200  
CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803

EXAMINER

MADSEN, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,901

Applicant(s)

RECCHIA, MICHAEL J.

Examiner

Robert Madsen

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2004 and 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 21-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on July 7, 2004 and October 1, 2004 have been entered. Claims 1-15, 21-30 remain pending in the application.

2. It is noted that the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) from the Office Action mailed April 22, 2004 are maintained for reasons stated in the Response to Arguments and are included in this Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 23 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not disclose a third

Art Unit: 1761

transverse seal *between* the flat unfolded first and mesh sheets, as recited in claims 23 and 29. The specification discloses two possible means of closing the opening of the bag: (1) a transverse seal between the first and second sheets spaced from the mesh sheet (i.e. item 44), and (2) gathering the second end of the bag near the second seal line wherein the mesh and first sheet are gathered together (i.e. item 45). Thus, when a third transverse seal is provided at the second end of the bag that closes the opening between the mesh and first sheet, (a) the sheets are not flat (i.e. they are gathered/bunched together) and (b) the seal is not *between* the mesh and first sheet (i.e. it is outside of the sheets).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1,2,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meseguer (DE 2972720932 U1) in view of Fox et al. (US 6190044 B1)

7. Regarding claims 1,2,14, Meseguer, teach a horticultural product bag comprising a mesh sheet with crossing sets of strands and one set perpendicular to the side as recited in claim 14 (see item 10 in Figures 1 and 2, item 2 of Figures 1- 4), a first thermoplastic sheet (item 1 of Figures 3 and 4) a second thermoplastic sheet (item 3 of Figures 3 and 4), side seals (item 6 of Figure 3), first end transverse seal (i.e. item 7) between the first end of the mesh sheet and the first thermoplastic sheet at the first end of the thermoplastic sheet as recited in claim 2, a second end transverse seal between the mesh sheet and the second thermoplastic sheet at the second end of the bag, and

Art Unit: 1761

the first thermoplastic sheet at the second end of the bag beyond the mesh sheet by substantially similar distance as the second sheet. Meseguer further teach two holes for holding the bag at the top, or second end, of the bag ( Figures 3 and 4, Abstract).).

8. However, Meseguer is silent in teaching that at the first end the thermoplastic sheet is folded around the mesh sheet as recited in claim 1.

9. Fox et al. also teach a produce bag comprising a mesh sheet with crossing sets of strands and one set perpendicular to the side as recited in claim 14(item 10 of Figure 5), a first thermoplastic sheet (item12 of Figure 5), and a second thermoplastic sheet (item 32 of Figure 5) forming a produce bag structure as recited in claim 1, including side seals (items 14 and 16 in Figure 1), a first transverse seal line (item 21 in Figure 5) at the first end of bag and first end of the thermoplastic sheet, as recited in claim 2, and a second seal as the second end of the bag between the second thermoplastic sheet and the mesh sheet (item 34). Fox et al. further teach the first end of the bag will have greater strength for filling large produce items by folding the first thermoplastic sheet over (at 10 b) the mesh sheet such that the mesh sheet is between the two portions of the folded thermoplastic sheet (at item 10a) and the first transverse seal is between the first thermoplastic sheet end and the outside of the mesh sheet (Column 1, lines 51-66,Column 4, lines 40-59).

10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Meseguer, and include folding the first thermoplastic sheet over (at 10 b) the mesh sheet such that the mesh sheet is between the two portions of the folded thermoplastic sheet (at item 10a) and the first transverse seal is between the first thermoplastic sheet end and the outside of the mesh

Art Unit: 1761

sheet since Fox et al. teach it is desirable to fold the first thermoplastic sheet to strengthen the second end of a produce bag comprising the same general structure as Meseguer. One would have been substituting one first end design structure for another for the same purpose: a produce bag comprising a mesh sheet sealed to a first and second thermoplastic sheet.

11. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meseguer (DE 2972720932 U1) in view of Fox et al. (US 6190044 B1) as applied to claims 1,2,14, above, further in view of Mercadini (EP0788974 A2).

12. Regarding claims 3 and 4, Meseguer teach the opening end of the bag is formed by the first and second thermoplastic sheets and teach holes for holding the bag at the opening end of the bag, but is silent in teaching a third transverse seal between the first and second thermoplastic sheets being spaced from the mesh sheet as recited in claims 3 and 4.

13. Mercadini also teaches a produce bag with one mesh side and one thermoplastic side wherein the bottom of the bag is formed by folding the thermoplastic sheet over the mesh sheet and the top of the bag includes holes for holding the bag (Abstract, Figure 5). Mercadini further teaches closing the bag by providing a transverse seal above and below the holes to seal the sheets together (Column 2, lines 20-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a third transverse seal between the two thermoplastic sheets of Meseguer since Mercadini teach closing the bag includes transverse seals above and below the holes for holding the bag, and in the case of Meseguer the a third transverse seal above the holes would be spaced from the

Art Unit: 1761

mesh sheet and only between the two thermoplastic sheets. One would have been substituting one conventional means for closing a bag for another for the same purpose: to provide a produce bag comprising a mesh side and a thermoplastic side with two holes at the filling end of the bag.

14. Regarding claim 5, Meseguer teaches a horticultural bag that may contain oranges (Abstract), but is silent in teaching onions. However, once it was known that the bag is for produce items such as oranges, which are conventionally packaged in mesh wall comprising bag, to select any particular type of produce, such as onions, would have been an obvious matter of choice depending on whether the produce is conventionally packaged in mesh wall comprising bags.

15. Claims 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meseguer (DE 2972720932 U1) in view of Fox et al. (US 6190044 B1) as applied to claims 1,2,14, above, further in view of Yamagata (JP411130089A) and Cammack (US 5741076).

16. Regarding claims 6,8,9, modified Meseguer, as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, teaches the first thermoplastic sheet is folded over the mesh sheet and sealed with a first transverse seal at the first end, but is silent in teaching a third thermoplastic sheet that is smaller than the first sheet, as recited in claim 8, and joined to the first sheet and mesh sheet by the first seal line and inside of the mesh sheet as recited in claims 6 and 9.

Art Unit: 1761

17. Yamagata also teaches a produce bag comprising a mesh sheet and a first thermoplastic sheet wherein the thermoplastic sheet is folded over the mesh sheet and sealed to the mesh sheet. However, Yamagata teaches providing an additional, smaller thermoplastic sheet, as recited in claim 8, on the inside of the mesh sheet at the seal to provide a means for adhering the folded thermoplastic sheet to the mesh, as recited in claims 6 and 9 (The embodiment of Figure 1 in light of paragraphs 16-22).

18. Cammack also teach sealing a thermoplastic sheet to a mesh sheet. Cammack is relied on as further evidence of utilizing an additional sheet on the opposite side of the thermoplastic sheet to provide a means for bonding the thermoplastic sheet to the mesh sheet (Column 5, lines 1-17).

19. Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a third thermoplastic sheet that is smaller than the first sheet, as recited in claim 8, and joined to the first sheet and mesh sheet by the first seal line and inside of the mesh sheet as recited in claims 6 and 9, to the bag of Meseguer since Yamagata teaches that in order to seal a thermoplastic sheet folded from one side of a produce bag onto the other mesh side of the bag, a smaller thermoplastic sheet is positioned under/ inside the mesh sheet to provide the sealing surface, and Cammack teaches sealing a mesh sheet and a thermoplastic sheet by adhering the thermoplastic sheet to a smaller sheet on the opposite side of the mesh sheet. One would have been substituting one means of sealing a mesh sheet to a thermoplastic sheet for the same purpose: adhering a folded portion of the thermoplastic sheet to the outside of the mesh sheet.



Art Unit: 1761

20. Regarding 7 and 10, modified Meseguer (i.e. as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above) has a first sheet positioned outside of the mesh sheet in the area adjacent to the first seal line.

21. Regarding claims 12 and 13, see the rejection of claims 2 and 14, respectively.

22. Claims 15,21,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meseguer (DE 2972720932 U1) in view of Fox et al. (US 6190044 B1) as applied to claims 1,2,14, above, further in view of Wolske (US 4207983) and Cammack (US 5741076).

23. Meseguer teach the opening end of the bag for horticultural bag is formed by the first and second thermoplastic sheets and teach holes for holding the bag at the opening end of the bag, but Meseguer is silent in teaching the bag is closed by a bunching member as recited in claim 15, such as a wire tie as recited in claim 21 adjacent to the second thermoplastic sheet as recited in claim 22.

24. Wolske also teaches a horticultural, or produce, bag comprising a mesh wall that is attached to a thermoplastic sheet providing holes for holding the bag, wherein the bag is closed with a wire tie after filling (Abstract, Column 3, lines 20-26 Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 2).

25. Cammack is relied on as further evidence of the conventionality of a produce bag comprising a mesh wall that is attached to a thermoplastic sheet providing holes for holding the bag , and closing the bag with a wire tie after filling is completed (Abstract, Figure6, Column 5, lines 18-34).

Art Unit: 1761

26. Therefore, to modify Meseguer and close the bag by a bunching member as recited in claim 15, such as a wire tie as recited in claim 21 would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on how the bags were filled since Meseguer teaches the open end of the bag provides holes for holding the bag, Wolske and Cammack teach when such holes are used during the filling process the bags are sealed at the mouth using a wire tie. One would have been substituting one conventional means for closing a bag for another. It would have been further obvious to place the wire tie adjacent to the second thermoplastic sheet as recited in claim 22, since this is end the bag that is open and Cammack teaches closing the end of the thermoplastic sheets.

27. Claims 23,24, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meseguer (DE 2972720932 U1) in view of Fox et al. (US 6190044 B1) and Mercadini (EP0788974 A2)

28. Regarding claims 23,24, 28,29,30, Meseguer, teach a horticultural product bag comprising a mesh sheet with crossing sets of strands and one set perpendicular to the side as recited in claim 28 (see item 10 in Figures 1 and 2, item 2 of Figures 1- 4), a first thermoplastic sheet (item 1 of Figures 3 and 4) a second thermoplastic sheet (item 3 of Figures 3 and 4), side seals (item 6 of Figure 3) , first end transverse seal (i.e. item 7) between the first end of the mesh sheet and the first thermoplastic sheet at the first end of the thermoplastic sheet as recited in claim 24, a second end transverse seal between the mesh sheet and the second thermoplastic sheet at the second end of the bag, and the first thermoplastic sheet at the second end of the bag beyond the mesh sheet by

Art Unit: 1761

substantially similar distance as the second sheet. Meseguer further teach two holes for holding the bag at the top, or second end, of the bag ( Figures 3 and 4, Abstract).).

29. However, Meseguer is silent in teaching that at the first end the thermoplastic sheet is folded around the mesh sheet as recited in claim 23 and a third transverse seal either between the flat unfolded first and second sheets, as recited in claim 30 and 23, or between the first and mesh sheets as recited in claim 29 and 23.

30. With respect to the particular first end structure, Fox et al. also teach a produce bag comprising a mesh sheet with crossing sets of strands and one set perpendicular to the side as recited in claim 28(item 10 of Figure 5), a first thermoplastic sheet (item 12 of Figure 5), and a second thermoplastic sheet (item 32 of Figure 5) forming a produce bag structure as recited in claim 23, including side seals (items 14 and 16 in Figure 1), a first transverse seal line (item 21 in Figure 5) at the first end of bag and first end of the thermoplastic sheet, as recited in claim 24, and a second seal as the second end of the bag between the second thermoplastic sheet and the mesh sheet (item 34). Fox et al. further teach the first end of the bag will have greater strength for filling large produce items by folding the first thermoplastic sheet over (at 10 b) the mesh sheet such that the mesh sheet is between the two portions of the folded thermoplastic sheet (at item 10a) and the first transverse seal is between the first thermoplastic sheet end and the outside of the mesh sheet (Column 1, lines 51-66, Column 4, lines 40-59) as recited in claim 24. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Meseguer, and include folding the first thermoplastic sheet over (at 10 b) the mesh sheet such that the mesh sheet is between the two portions of the folded thermoplastic sheet (at item 10a) and

Art Unit: 1761

the first transverse seal is between the first thermoplastic sheet end and the outside of the mesh sheet since Fox et al. teach it is desirable to fold the first thermoplastic sheet to strengthen the second end of a produce bag comprising the same general structure as Meseguer. One would have been substituting one first end design structure for another for the same purpose: a produce bag comprising a mesh sheet sealed to a first and second thermoplastic sheet.

31. With respect to a third transverse seal, Mercadini also teaches a produce bag with one mesh side and one thermoplastic side wherein the bottom of the bag is formed by folding the thermoplastic sheet over the mesh sheet and the top of the bag includes holes for holding the bag (Abstract, Figure 5). Mercadini further teaches closing the bag by providing a transverse seal above and below the holes to seal the sheets together (Column 2, lines 20-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a third transverse seal between the two thermoplastic sheets of Meseguer, as recited in claims 23 and 30 since Mercadini teach closing the bag includes transverse seals above and below the holes for holding the bag, and in the case of Meseguer the a third transverse seal above the holes would be spaced from the mesh sheet and only between the two thermoplastic sheets. To further include a third transverse seal between the first and mesh sheet, as recited in claim 29, would have been an obvious design choice, depending how far down below the holes one placed the seal since Mercadini teach closing the bag includes transverse seals above and below the holes for holding the bag. One would have been substituting one conventional means for closing a bag for

Art Unit: 1761

another for the same purpose: to provide a produce bag comprising a mesh side and a thermoplastic side with two holes at the filling end of the bag.

32. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meseguer (DE 2972720932 U1) in view of Fox et al. (US 6190044 B1) and Mercadini (EP0788974 A2) as applied to claims 23,24,28-30 above, further in view of Yamagata (JP411130089A) and Cammack (US 5741076).

33. Regarding claims 25 –27, modified Meseguer (i.e. as discussed in the rejection of claim 23 above) has a first thermoplastic sheet folded outside of the mesh sheet in the area adjacent to the first seal line, as recited in claim 26, but is silent in teaching a third thermoplastic sheet that is smaller than the first sheet, as recited in claim 27, and joined to the first sheet and mesh sheet by the first seal line and inside of the mesh sheet as recited in claim 25

34. Yamagata also teaches a produce bag comprising a mesh sheet and a first thermoplastic sheet wherein the thermoplastic sheet is folded over the mesh sheet and sealed to the mesh sheet. However, Yamagata teaches providing an additional, smaller thermoplastic sheet, as recited in claim 27, on the inside of the mesh sheet at the seal to provide a means for adhering the folded thermoplastic sheet to the mesh, as recited in claim 25(The embodiment of Figure 1 in light of paragraphs 16-22).

35. Cammack also teach sealing a thermoplastic sheet to a mesh sheet. Cammack is relied on as further evidence of utilizing an additional sheet on the opposite side of

Art Unit: 1761

the thermoplastic sheet to provide a means for bonding the thermoplastic sheet to the mesh sheet (Column 5, lines 1-17).

36. Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a third thermoplastic sheet that is smaller than the first sheet, as recited in claim 27, and joined to the first sheet and mesh sheet by the first seal line and inside of the mesh sheet, as recited in claim 25, to the bag of Meseguer since Yamagata teaches that in order to seal a thermoplastic sheet folded from one side of a produce bag onto the other mesh side of the bag, a smaller thermoplastic sheet is positioned under/ inside the mesh sheet to provide the sealing surface, and Cammack teaches sealing a mesh sheet and a thermoplastic sheet by adhering the thermoplastic sheet to a smaller sheet on the opposite side of the mesh sheet. One would have been substituting one means of sealing a mesh sheet to a thermoplastic sheet for the same purpose: adhering a folded portion of the thermoplastic sheet to the outside of the mesh sheet.

### ***Response to Arguments***

37. Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

38. With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Applicant asserts that Page 4, lines 16 and 17 provide support for the third seal limitation between the first and mesh sheets of claims 23 and 29. Claim 23 recites

a third, straight transverse seal extending across the width of the bag and closing said bag adjacent to said second thermoplastic sheet, said third seal being formed between flat, unfolded first and second sheets or between flat, unfolded first and mesh sheets.

However, Page 4 states:

Art Unit: 1761

Then, the bag may be gathered into a bunched-up neck 43, by a wire tie, hog ring, or the like as indicated by arrows 45 for bag closure, as shown in the broken line portion of Fig. 2. Alternatively, a third transverse seal 44 may be imposed as shown between second sheet 32 and sheet portion 36 to form a strong seal line.

And Page 5 states:

third seal line 44 may be formed in a conventional manner between second sheet 32 and sheet portion 36 at the upper bag end, or a bunching member 45 such as a hog ring is used.

Therefore, Page 4 and Page 5 are interpreted to mean that the 2<sup>nd</sup> end of the bag is closed by *either* (1) a wire tie, hog ring or the like between the first and mesh sheet which involves bunching or (2) a transverse seal between the first and second sheet. While the seal 44 shown in Figure 1 appears to be a "straight" seal, it is not disclosed how a wire tie or hog ring creates a "straight" transverse seal when this involves "bunching" the sheets. Furthermore, while the seal 44 is "between" the first and second sheet, seal 45 is clearly outside of the bag and not physically between the first and mesh sheet. For these reasons, the rejection is maintained.

39. With respect to rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), there is no evidence on the record that supports Applicant's assertion of prior invention relative to Fox et al. (US 6190044). A declaration filed in Applicant's prior application cannot be relied on because the present application is not related to the prior application (i.e. it is neither a continuation nor a divisional application of the prior application). The rejections stands for the reasons stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

40. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the

Art Unit: 1761

application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

41. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

42. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

43. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

44. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.



Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.



Art Unit: 1761

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Madsen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1761



MILTON I. CANO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700